P.7. 288-92

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

LR 77-89
" 51-83
" 32-76.

Later references.

1895-96

192

(LR)

File No. 153-95

Serial Nos. 1 to 13

P.90

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 13

Part B for May 1896

SUBJECT.

Petition of Jangamakote Srinivasa Rao praying for the separation of Anand Kadamakote in the Sidlaghatta Taluk from the Village of Hospete

To,

1. The / The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District.
2. Superintendent Revenue Survey.

No. 9909-10 / P.7. 288-92 dt. 5/13. 5. 1896.

Instructing him that if the Gumasta Hanumantappa does not accept the appointment appropriated Amount, he may be dismissed from Service. And further action will be taken or taken -

Indorsed

WD 236—G.P.S.—20,000—12-6-20

1. Petitions

I, No. 383, 830, 842 and 842 presented by J. Srinivasa Rao Shanbagi Kakdar of Bhandarkere and other villages, Siddapur Shalmali Sirsi Taluk

II. No. 389 and 2991 presented by Nettakeri Linga Rau, Shanbagi Kakdar of Annani Bhadranakere and other villages, Siddapur Shalmali Sirsi Taluk

III. No. 333 presented by J. Lakshminarayana, Clerk Sub-division office, Chickballapur

~~IV. No. 203 presented by Venkatesha, Shanbogue of Hasanpur~~

Subject

Application to review an Order passed in the Honourable Commissioners on the 6th May 1893 about the Shanbogi of Bhadranakere and Jayanthipur and about the separation of Bhadranakere from Hosapete.

---

1 J. Srinivasa Rau who despa-

served the first series of
Vakils was in 1883 appointed
Shanbogue of the following
villages:— Bharamadiru,
Jangamkote, Bhyrasandra,
Hirehalla, Gollalli and Ra-
Ramachanhalli. In 1884 one
Hanumantarayappa was appointed
to officiate as Shanbogue pro-
tempore of these villages, because
the registered Shanbogue Sri-
nivasa Rau, having obtained
a situation elsewhere, could
not perform the duties of
Shanbogue. This Hanumanta-
rayappa embezzled ~~the revenue~~
~~collections of these villages the~~
~~extent of Rs~~ Rs 797-11-1 out
of the revenue collections of these
Villages @ and absconded in 1886.
The matter was reported to the
Deputy Com.r, Kolar instituted and
it was ordered that the registered
Shanbogue should make good
the embezzled amount. He
raised objections to pay the amount,
and correspondence was being
carried on between the Regd.
Shanbogue, the Amildar and

X, Div.l Inspr's order No: 777 S/d 12.80
and Devanhalli Amildar's order No: 5
S/d 17/18. 4.80

@ Bharamadiru —— 444-12-8
Jangamkote —— 19-10-6
Hirehalla —— 89-0-3
Bhyrasandra —— 115-10-7
Gollalli —— 81-5-3
Ramachanhalli —— 146-11-10
797-11-1

O. Sellathi Pandaffa Nadarchera Rani Sellathi Subbaken and Sons.

the Retired Comr., when other persons who are sharers in the Pranigi of the ~~first two~~ villages applied that they should pay the embezzled amt. if the Pranigi was registered in their name.

2 In time again, at the survey settlement of Siddipatna Taluk in 1871 another petition applied ~~that~~ to the Survey Superintendent that the ~~village of~~ Bhavanakere should be amalgamated with the neighbouring village of Hosjete, (which is at a distance of only ½ a mile), after some correspondence between the Survey Supt., Dy Comr and Amildar the two were amalgamated i.e. Bhavi Siddambika was merged in Hosjete

3- When Srinivasa Rau was asked to pay the embezzled amt he wanted that Bhavanakere and Hosjete should be separated. The Dy Comr said that there was no connection between the embezzlement and the amalgamation and directed that Srinivasa Rau should pay the money.

4. Srinivasa Rau appealed to

~~Government in 1894.~~

Government in 1890. The other parties also applied to Govt. and later, Sirdar Le heard on this Connection. On the 5th May 1893 Govt. referred the matter to the Dist. Comr. asking him to hold an enquiry and settle the matter in dispute and, if necessary, to apply to Govt. for instructions. The Dist. Comr. sent his report on 16-6-94 and on the 6th May 1895 Govt. passed the following order:—

"As Amani Biaranakire is no longer a separate village, having been amalgamated at the Survey Settlement with the adjacent village of Hospete, the delimitation of the Shanbogi's Biaranakire from that of Hospete cannot now be sanctioned. The Settlement Survey (represented by the Assistant Superintendent Gundappa) advised that the Shanbogi of Hospete to the exclusion of the other branches, and that two-thirds share in the Shanbogi of Biaranakire, while continue to hold the Shanbogi of

the combined new village, and the heirs and Prabhadeva Row of the Desa Kulkarni family will be registered as subordinate hakdars, receiving 3/8 share in the Shanbogi of Madanahalli (equivalent to 1/7 of the combined village) and allowed a preferential claim to succeed to the office of the combined village when no members of the Hellakki family are forthcoming, or to officiate according to a system, should they be able to introduce such a system. In respect of the Shanbogi of Jangamkote and other villages, the arrangements made by the Deputy Comr, Bangalore District in 1874 and 1880, under which the office is now held by heirs of a member of the Desa Kulkarni family will be maintained, the members of the Hellakki and Kasba families who are entitled to a share in the Shanbogi of Jangamkote being registered as subordinate hakdars as indicated above.

(7)

Bhadravakere and Hospete cannot be separated. ~~His~~ He requests that the two shd be separated for the following reasons:—

(1) That there is no necessity for the amalgamation.

(2) That the Amildar and Dy Comr were in favour of separation.

(3) That these two were surveyed, mapped and settled separately

(4) That the amalgamation was ordered ~~entirely~~ only to promote the interests of the Settlement staff.

(5) That when it was proposed that certain persons of other villages in the same Taluk should be amalgamated, Govt after hearing the representations of the Shanbogues, did not sanction the proposal.

(6) That at the time amalgamation of ~~Bhadravati~~ was sanctioned on the understanding that the Shanbogues ~~should~~ of the 2 villages shd perform the duties by rotation.

a Memo) Supt. in his letter No: 915 11/12/86 Copy received.

The first five grounds are urged in his English petn d/d No: 583 d/d 3.8.95

This ground is urged in his English petn No: 812 d/d 16.8.95

See also Survey Supt's Lr dt No: 2661 of 20/9/86

~~(7) That the Views expressed by the Councillors who heard the case on 27.9.94~~ (8)

(7)⊗ That the order of the 6th May 1895 does not accord with the Views expressed by the Hon'ble Councillors who heard the case on 27th× Sept.r 1894.

He requests that he should be heard in Council, ~~and wants~~ that no steps for the recovery of the embezzled amount shd. be taken till the review petn. is disposed of and that orders to this effect shd. be issued to the Sidlaghatta Amildar.

⊗ This ground is stated in Engl: petn. No: 583 d/d 3.8.95 & No: 730 d/d 12.8.95.

× On receipt of the Dr Commr's rep of 16-6-94, Serial No (19), case was posted to 27-9-94 & was heard by the 1st Councillor Mr. Chentsal Rau

⁂ ⁂ His English petn. No: 1842

7. The following is a summary of the proceedings relating to the amalgamation of Bhavanikere with Hospete.

In the Mysore Gazette of the 26th Feb: 1887 ~~the amalgama~~ it was announced that Bhavanikere was amalgamated with Hospete. On the 12th March 1887 Srinivasa Rau (petr. 1st series) put in a petn. to Govt. complaining of the amalgamation. By endorsement No: 3804 d/d 24th March 1887 he was directed to apply to the Dy. Comr. ~~Petr.~~ On the 29th Jan: 1887 Srinivasa Rau presents his petn. to the Dy. Comr. The latter

(1)

in the case of Hospete.
(2) The embezzlement having
taken place when Bhavana.
Rao was in the charge of
Pet^r. Irinivasa Row Gumasta,
the full amt. embezzled should
be recovered from Pet^r. in two
instalments ie half now and
the other half six months
hence. Should the fair Duke
these payments, the misappro-
priated amount so far as it
relates to Bhavanakere and
Jangamkote may be recovered
from Gundappa ajitha Shettaka
family who offers to pay the
same, and he appointed exclu-
sively in charge of these villages.
If Irinivasa Row does not pay
the amt. relating to the other
four villages, he must be dis-
missed, and any of the allotments
willing to pay the amount appointed.
If this order that is now sought to be
revised. ~~The reasons urged by~~
~~Pet^r. Irinivasa Row are.~~
(1) ~~That~~ Pet^r. Irinivasa Row's
objections rest in that part of
the proceedings which says that

8 The villages of Koopele and Bhadrankere were as a matter of fact surveyed and settled separately (vide docket No 919 dated 11th March 1896 from the Survey Superintendent to the Deputy Commissioner). Prior to such settlement they must have been mapped as separate villages.

9 The Settlement was introduced in 1885-86 (between May and July)

10 Either at the time of or shortly after the Settlement, some of the Shanbhags seem to have complained to the Settlement Officer (Major Rutherford) of the Settlement having injuriously affected their status. Among them were Soobien and others of the Hattakki family. These are stated to have presented a petition to the Survey Department praying for the Amalgamation of Bhadrankere, as before with Koopele. Soob Rao says in his deposition that in making this request, he and other

shareers benefit of looking after the duties by turns and thereby enjoying the remuneration.

The Settlement Officer, after hearing the objections urged, submitted a statement showing what villages had in his opinion to be merged with other villages. This statement was referred by the Survey Supdt for the opinion of the Deputy Comm.r. No 155 dated 27th August 1885

On 2d September 1885,* the Dy. Commissioner called for the Amildar's opinion. The Amildar in his report No 255 of 2d June 1886* says as follows:— * No 211

Hospete and Amani Bhadranhere formerly formed one village Recently they have been separated. The Hospete Shanbhog has 2/3rds share in the Kiré Shanbhogi. The original Shanbhogi Haldar of these 2 villages is Hettaldki Narsappa, Grandfather of the Hospete Shanbhogne. Under these circumstances, there is no objection to their amalgamation The Deputy Commissioner then

wrote his reply to the Survey Supt Gudr, Survey — Bhadran Kere is a large tank, Bhagpur lands are also included in this. Water supply for has to be arranged for. Therefore it may be kept separate.

The Survey Supt then sent back the statement & the Deputy Supt asking him to make the necessary changes therein with reference to the Deputy Commrs observations.

In reply to the above, the Deputy Supt wrote as follows in respect of Hospete and Bhadrankere :— "I had proposed in the Statement that Bhadrankere should be amalgamated with Hospete. The Deputy Commr writes that it would be better to keep Bhadrankere separate, because it is a large tank and Bhagapur lands are also included therein. But the bed of the Bhadrankere tank is to the north of the Hospete village and is thus separated from the rest

x No 414 of 3rd August 1886

x No 2233 of 11th August '86

No 287 of 10th Sept '86

(13)

that Bhadrankere should be amalgamated with Hoopale as first settled by me and I have allowed the entry made first to remain as it is. The Survey Superintendent then wrote to the Deputy Commissioner thus — 'Bhadrankere cannot but be amalgamated with Hoopale. There is no other course open (ಬೇರೆ ಏನೂ ದಾರಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ) It is urged that by so amalgamating, the hak of one would be transferred to another. But this need not happen inasmuch as arrangement could be made for the Shanbhogas working by Rotation. By this means

* No 2661 of 20-9-86

the discharge of work will be facilitated. The Deputy Commissioner wrote* in reply thus - 'I agree to effect being given to the arrangement proposed by Mr Rutherfurd. Care will be taken when apportioning charges that no Shanbhog loses his haki'.

12. The amalgamation was accordingly sanctioned and notified in the Mysore Gazette of the 26th February 1887.

13 On the 12th March 1887 Srinivasa Row (petitioner 1st series) sent in a petition to Government complaining of the amalgamation. By Endorsement No 3800 dated 24th March 1887, he was directed to apply to the Deputy Commissioner. On the 29th November 1887, Sreenivasa Row presented his petition to the Deputy Commr. The then

* No 631 of 15-11-86

lands thereunder which are
to the south of the same village.
The tanks and the lands of
Hospete are in the middle.
Besides this, the lands of the
two villages are dovetailed.
Only 12 numbers of the Obaya
Inam lands are included
in the map of Bhadravathi.
They are not in one block,
but are in different places.
In this connection the Amildar
has on 2nd June '86 reported
that these two, Hospete and
Bhadravathi, formed one
village formerly, that the
Hospete Shanbhag has $\frac{2}{3}$ rds
share in the Sire Shanbhogi,
that the original holder
of these two villages was Hattalli
Narasappa, grandfather of
the Hospete Shanbhogs, and
that there is no objection
to the Enfranchisement.

Therefore I am of
opinion

O. Book No: 25 of 12.87

Mr. Com. Rev. Commissioner wrote to the Amildar of Siddapura as follows:— "To what village has Bhadranakere formerly attached? Also how far is Bhadranakere from Hosplete and Jangamkote? What are the revenue collections of Hospete and Bhadranakere? Is there any objection to separate them?"

X. No: 17 of 8-4-88.

X. The Amildar's reply thereto is — "Bhadranakere was formerly a village by itself. It is 1½ miles from Jangamkote and ½ a mile from Hospete. The Rev. Collection of Hospete in Vyaya was Rs 722-5-6 and of Bhadranakere Rs 1538-11-2. There is no objection to keep the village separate, as it was formerly."

14 On 6-4-88 Sheristadar Gundappa Shanbhogue of Hospete presented a petition to the Com. saying that the villages should not be separated, that at the Settlement the Amildar went through the entire records and submitted his report No: 255 in favor of amalgamation, that the Com. and Government sanctioned it, that Sellakki Narsappa was originally entitled to the Shanbhogue of both these villages and that, for all these reasons, no

Value should be attached to the
Amildar's report No: 17 of 8.4.88.

The 1st Class sent this petition to the Amildar, who enquired about the matter and sent his report No: 91 dt 2.5.88 for the complainant and others the accounts of Bhandare the Inamdar, Bharadi or the Mahals in Taluka of Patan.

the former, replied in reply thereto:— No: 103 dt 2.5.88

In the correspondence carried on, it is mentioned that one person is the Inamdar of both the villages and thus the two have been amalgamated. As Bhandare was forming a village in itself, I say that there is no objection to keep it separate from Kelewadi. Bhandare used to be Inamdar formerly but in Sanvat (1887) 88 he got himself separated and Bhandare formed part of Inam of Kelewadi and after the Inam Enquiry of the village— Thereupon the 1st Class Talukdar the 2nd Class sent the following order:— X No: 224 dt 24.7.88.

As Bhandare has been amalgamated with Kelewadi, no alienation can be made now. But as the revenue collection of the first is more than that of the second, the Shendipanes may work by turns — one for 2 years and the other for one year. Take the Kaifiyat of the Shendipanes in this respect and send a report.

The Amildar reply† is — Vetkari Sundarjee is not willing to officiate by turns. He also says that Circular No: 13 issued by the Prantadicary Division Supt on 5.11.85 directs that the system of allowing taking works from Shendipanes by turns should at once be put a stop to. The system of rotation are † Report No: 265 dt 4.8.88.

cause much confusion because the Shanbogue will not be annually for one year
of the ensuing years proceedings. One will want to get rid of the other and so they will cause the ryots to prefer false complaints. Factions will arise in the village. For these reasons the system of rotation ~~shall be~~ need not, must not be introduced as directed by the circular, but be introduced.

⊗ Endorsement on above report 3/3 30. 9. 88

⊗ Hyd. Rahman then proposed to separate the villages or to have the Bhandaree man as Shanbogue and the Nirgunte man as his deputy. To this effect a petition was sent to the Survey Superintendent 3. 10. 88.

Hyd: 3884 0/5
X. 17. 11. 88

The Survey Supt. sent the following in reply: — "The two were analysed in accordance with your office letter No: 63/3. 37. A 86. No alteration can be made now. You say that the natives are not willing to work by turns; but it is not thought necessary to consult them in this matter. All the Russedars might work by rotation according to their shares. It would, in my opinion, lead to confusion if a Shanbogue and a deputy Shanbogue are appointed."

17

The matter seems to have been dropped there, and Sri. Srinivasa Rao required to pay up the arrears. He appealed to Government as noted in para 4 above, and with reference to the contention in regard to the annual rotation in the land appeals to the Commr. Mr. Chadwick noted as follows:-

"It will be seen from the above correspondence that my predecessor Mr. Abdul Rahiman was of opinion that the Tavanikkal should be allowed to remain distinct from Kuzhi as before or if such an arrangement were found impracticable, the Manigar of the latter might be appointed to head and that Kuzhi to the Manigar of the village as were connected with the latter. Mr. Rahiman does not mention in his report that is dated [illegible] connected with the village, nor is he informed on this point from which the parties concerned do not consent. I would therefore beg to recommend that the arrangement made during the survey settlement might be enforced, each Swamboge informing the Cutcherry of the office for a period in proportion to the revenue of each village".

Dated [illegible] submitting his above letter Board's Proceedings ordered in [illegible] dated [illegible]. This is to be done says in this letter No: 4656/1129 dated 16.6.94, paragraphs 44, 45 and 46 — Looking to the individuality of the interest involved in the Swamboge of Kerpede which is shared in by the members of one family (the Vellatti family) while that of Bhadrakkare is divided between the members of both the Vellatti and the Vedakattukaran families, it would seem convenient to separate the lands from the village and restore the former to the independent position which it held before the Survey settlement. There is also a great disparity between the revenue of the lands and that of the village which

(X) His letter No: 2903/689 dated 7.9.91 paragraph 10.

The Manager, in his letter of 8.9.91 explained with the arrangement referred to in the above letter, that the separation made by the former Manigar [illegible] the Swamboge should be permitted to do duty by Rotation."

Y Journal No 19

appears little less than 1/2 nd of the former.

If the above arrangement be considered impracticable, I would submit as an alternative proposal that the Shanbogue of Bhadravathi be regarded as the head and head of Hospete as the deputy Shanbogue, the former keeping some of the accounts of the taluk and the latter the remainder, each receiving a proportionate share of the hobli.

Nellakki Jundappa may continue to be one of the Shanbogues.

16 On receipt of the above report the Dy Commr was asked to enquire into the matter by an order of [illegible] and the above is his opinion after the enquiry.

17 Petitioner in his petition of 3.8.95 para 4 says that the Amildar on 17.5.86 submitted as his opinion that the amalgamation should not take place:

Thus it will be seen that three Govt Courts and two Amildars

8 all the parties were heard in Council, and the Govt (the Dewan & the Honble the Secretary) declined to interfere with the separation of the two villages made on order for the reason of the existing general custom in accordance with the principle followed in other similar cases

as the petr says) are in favour of separation. The petrs have been complaining of this amalgamation from the very beginning. He was not in the village at the time of amalgamation. He was employed in Mangalore and other places. Again the respte Shanbogi exercising belongs to the Hattiaki family. They are also entitled to a 2/3rd share in the Shanbogi Shanbogi of Siddapur. ~~On the whole the Hattiaki family~~ These are all undisputed points. On the whole the Hattiaki family has 3/4 of the Shanbogi and the Desakulkarni 1/4 of the Shanbogi of the new village formed by the amalgamating and the order of G. S. Dated that Hattiaki family (his family has 3/4 the share) should be the Shanbogue of the new village.

(21)

(X). Hellakki Shibba Rau's affn before the 1st Asst Comr. in this connection see Mudhol Magistrate's report No: 1255 of 2/6/86

21 From the year 1835 till the amalgamation the two said formed separate charges for the Hellakki family and since they entered that division to 1835 they were united as one village.

22 From the year 1864 onwards the Desa Kulkarni family have undoubtedly officiated as Shanbogues of Mahadevkere.

23 Coming to the 3rd ground for review, the Petr's statement is supported by Hellakki Subba Rau's petition presented to this office on 2.2.93 and by his affn before the 1st Asst Comr. The concluding paragraph of Subba Rau's letter (X) also shows that at the time of settlement it was arranged that the Shanbogues should work by rotation. Petr says that as the system of rotation is opposed to the existing rules, [illegible] which the amalgamation which, he says, was sanctioned on the condition that the

(X) No: 233 dt 2.2.93 Received No (7) See in this connection Survey Supdt's report No: 2661 of 20th Oct 86

algamated between themselves and Sundappa the latter was the owner of a large right [illegible] even may hereafter the share of the amount now be interfered with, Sreenivasa Rao reserving to himself the power to prosecute Sundappa

Therefore it must be mentioned in the proceedings that Sundappa alone shd pay the embezzled amount of Bhadrakere and shd also pay the Lobji to the several shareholders.

(3) Since coming into office, Sundappa has himself taken all the Ananti produce, without paying the other sharers. Therefore it shd be ordered that each shareholder shd collect his share.

(4) He is willing to pay the embezzled money of Bhadrakere and Jangamkote and also the Nur embezzled amts due by the Jangamkote family if that family shd not pay it. Those amts shd be received from him and he shd be registered as Shanbogue of the villages.

(5) If Hospete is not registered in his name, then arrangements for doing the work by rotation, in conformity with the opinion of the majority of shareholders, shd be made.

(6). Gundappa is not the registered Shanboque of Bhadravankere or Hospete. So pltff, who has the largest share, should be registered as Shanboque.

4. Gundappa's father was the Shanboque of Hospete. After his death Gundappa succeeded. Subbarow has no share in Hospete Shanboqui; Subbarow has 4 shares in Bhadravankere Shanboqui whereas Gundappa has only one share. Upon this last fact he bases his first and last grounds of review.

17 As to the 2nd ground — it is true that H. Gundappa, in his depn before the Wr Court, says that the mill pays the embezzled amount of Bhadravankere and will also pay the profit to the other Shareers.

28 As to the 3rd ground — H. Gundappa says that, as the other shareers were not paying their share of the profits due on the loan mentioned, he himself paid the whole and took enjoyed the produce.

29/4 th ground — The Hallakki being has no shares in the other 4 Villages (excepting Bhadravankere and

Subbarow's

@ Deposition before Wr Co

2. Gundappa's depn bef

Shanmugam Pillai's work by rotation must now be cancelled and the two villages separated.

Held. There is on record an opinion expressed by the Judicial Councillor (then 3rd Councillor) that the 2nd Commissioner recommended that the villages should be separated is approved of by Govt. We have one of the Councillors who heard the case on 27.9.94. [illegible]

[illegible]

Mr. Nallathi Sivaba Pillai (petr 2nd series) applies for a review of the same order on the following grounds: ——

(1) That he has a larger share in the Bharanikave Shanbagam than Gnanapiria and therefore he must be registered as Shanbogue.

(2) That Gnanapiria has expressed his willingness to pay the whole amount (Rs 1000) and to pay the rest of the Shanbogam if the Shanbogam is given to him.

* This is a draft of the [illegible] of the 1st Commissioner on the 8th March 1895 and submitted to the Board [illegible] Govt is an abstract of the [illegible]

The order of the Board in 1895 is quite correct & cannot now be revised. The order was not based upon the principle that the Shanbogam could work by rotation but it was upon the possibility of certain evils in the contemplation of Govt which came into force. Govt the system of rotation was not upon operational convenience after the order — before 1835 the two villages were one — & it was after — mature consideration — that Government — the Board —

Jayawickrama). The Deathakarayas family is exclusively entitled to the Shanbogie of these villages. ~~Interpreter to Police Court~~

30 5th ground — She wants that each shanbogie should efficiate by turns. She says this was the understanding when Bhadrankere was amalgamated with Hospete. Government have been pleased to arrange for the rotation of work among the shanbogues of Kadagattur, Jnanoor, Sirsi Taluk, Dunbur District.

In this case also Govt. Sanction arranges for rotation. The last paragraph ~~the last part~~ of the decision in the Kadagattur case is as follows:— "As all the shares, however, cannot be allowed to perform the duties of the office jointly, the appellants who represent one branch of the family should be allowed to select two of them to do the duties of the village for a period of 5 years, at the end of which the 1st and 2nd Respts., who are the members of the 2nd branch, will be allowed to do duties for a similar period. This arrangement appears to be equitable as the

⊗. Sis petn. of 2-2-93 and his depn. before Dy. Comr.

X. 5th June 1890

X Subbarao's depn. before Dy. Comr.

that amount shd be received from Hettakki Gundappa. ~~Lakshminarayappa's father and J. Srinivasa Row (Pet^r 1st series) are brothers.~~ He wants that this portion shd be modified and that he shd be allowed (and not A^p Hettakki Gundappa) to pay the money if Srinivasa Row (Pet^r 1st series) fails to pay. Srinivasa this Lakshminarayappa has two brothers. His father and Srinivasa Row (Pet^r 1st series) are brothers.

A.S.
20/1/96

The D^t Comr was also asked to report as to what steps had been taken by him for carrying out the Govt order now sought to be reversed. In reply he submits "The Amildar's urzi No: 445 d/d 28th Ultimo filed with those proceedings shows that a notice has been served on Jayantkote Srinivasa Row calling upon him to make good the embezzled money, but that the latter was time pending disposal of his application to the Council for

Paragraphs 2 and 3 of his letter No. 2296/579 d/d 14.12.95 (3)

a review of the Govt orders alluded to above.

3. The Amildar reports that he has also issued a similar notice to Hellakki Gundappa and that the result will be reported shortly. He has sent up two petitions, as per margin one from J. Lakshminarayappa, son of Janjankote Gundappah, and the other from Chitamber Row, son of Mahadeva Row, both of the Desakulkarni family, offering to pay up the embezzled money relating to the four villages of Hireballa, Byrasandra, Lavamanya Gollahalli, and Kayangutta Hemannahalli."

A.S.
22.1.96 Continuation

The Deputy Comr was asked to forward to this office his letter No: 631 of 15/11/86 to the address of the Survey Supt and papers connected therewith as well as the papers showing the arrangement made during the settlement referred to in Dy Comr's letter to this office No: 293/687 of 7/11/91. He was also asked to report if the allegation, that the two villages of Hosapete and Amani Bhavankere were surveyed, mapped and settled separately, was true. Papers not have been embodied in the above pieces

~~The Deputy Commr is requested to forward the papers~~

Submit for orders
The Shanbhog of Hosapete named

This report has been subt with letter Gundappa is willing to make good the money as far as it relates to Bhadra Janjankote on his being allowed to of the Shanbhogship of the last named Virupa that Srinivasa Rao having fail

X. No: 3534/56 d/d 14.9.95

contain 2 of Sept 1895.

Q. d/d 16.11.95.

Srinivasa Rao must be called produce the embezzled am letter - from the petitioners to effect must be done order may be passed that he should be - passed - the Gundappa to appointed the receiver in the Janjankote to other with Srinivasa Rao

1st and 2nd Respondents have, during the last five years, performed the duties of these two villages." The words of the Kadagattur case are submitted with the proceedings in this case for reference if necessary.

Lakshminarayana (Pt. 3rd series) ⊗ only requires that he shd be allowed to pay the amount due on account of Jayamkonda and the Kist of Villages of J. Srinivasa Rau does not pay it.

He says that his father Hotta of Jayamkonda Jundappa was the Shanbogue of these 6 villages and after his death Jayamkonda Jundappa was dismissed in 1875. These are borne out by the records. He also says that the Chief Comr in his proceedings No: 9026 / 199 X 1/12/76 ordered that the Shanbogi Shd not be alienated from Jayamkonda Jundappa's family. His complaint therefore relates to that part of the order (suprà now reversed) which directs that if J. Srinivasa Rau does not pay the amount due for Jayamkonda

the matter was subsequently Kadagattur proceeded under appeal as aforesaid - the system of work is attended with difficulty & uncertainty & is liable to much misconception & mischief - the office cannot be carried on unless the management is regulated by rules & there are checks to prevent abuse or wrong doing on the part of the subordinate officers - Moreover the Kadagattur case was decided by the Commissioner in Mysore - Mysore applies to the whole of the Province also.

⊗ See the English petition of 2-4-78

X The words following in the record

named Achappa has now come forward with his complaint against the confirmation. He urges:—

(1) that lands measuring 130 acres and assessed at Rs. 150 which formed part of [illegible] (B[illegible]) were at the Survey Settlement included in [illegible] here, and with an entire merged in Hospete.

(2) that his jodi has thereby been reduced by Rs. 60, annually.

[initials] 12/4

a collateral heir of Srinivasa[illegible] [illegible] It does not appear that he was a party [illegible] 15th [illegible] 1895. Under [illegible] of 1889 [illegible] his [illegible] request that on default by security he has [illegible] be permitted to pay the embezzled amount which falls to his share of Jangamkote Jika is not unreasonable. The Dy. Comr will however enquire into this matter before Gondappa [illegible] Narasappa & others inherited and [illegible] gift as he [illegible] probably Gondappa's interest in Jangamkote is limited to one-third of that village alone. Achappa's complaint cannot now be heeded at this distance of time & must be rejected.

Treasury Councillor
[initials]
14/4/96

Recd 15.4.96

[initials]
17/4/96

C
17-4-96

Draft Pro [initials] 17/4

Def
16/8

Vide Ele 553

Ap 1552-95

Appl for dispn of certain
land by Govt to Govt
Sundappa Shettikar
Sanad issued
In time.
With reference to the allegation
in para 3 of the petn that
Gundappa deposited before the
Sirkar Canara the record with
regard to the land now the
subject of the appln and the
petitioner & in support of the
allegation. The Dy Commr may
at the same time be asked
why action has not been taken
to give effect to the order of Govt
and with what result.

Issued 26-8-95
Dy Regd 27-8-95

Govt 4
22-8-95

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1895

No. 559

Name of Petitioner. Hettikar Subbakka

Village. Bangalore

Taluk.

District.

Date of Appl. 3 August 1895

Date of Receipt. 3 August 1895

Date of Dispeal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

Petr applies for remission of Govt Prop no 22412 P. 7288-92

The grounds for remission
(1) The above Prop directed that in case Sreenivasa Rao failed to pay the amount misappropriated by his grumasta, the amount should be recovered from Gundappa and both the villages Jangamkote & Bharamakere should be registered in the name of the said Gundappa as petr owns a larger share in Bharamakere than Gundappa petitioners should be relieved

the work should be
taken from him.

S Gundappa is not
the registered shareholder
of the cocoanuts and
Hospet. He is only a
subordinate workman.
Petitioner has got a large
share and his name should
therefore be registered.

W.A.

2 Hethakki Gundappa has deposed before the Deputy Commr that if the Shanbhogi of Bhadana kere was given to him he would not only pay the whole amount that has been misappropriated but would also pay all the hissedars their Potgi. Orders should be issued accordingly As the Shanbhogi office of Bhadranakere is also ordered to be given to him the whole amount due in respect of the "kere" (tank) should be recovered from him only.

3 Hethakki Gundappa has ever since the amalgamation of Bhadranakere with his own village discharged the duties of the office and enjoyed the Inam produce. Orders should be passed permitting the other hissedars to take the proportionate produce.

4 In case the amount misappropriated is not recovered from the Jangam Kote family, petitioner is prepared to pay it. The office should therefore be registered in his name. If the petitioner pays the amounts due on the villages [redacted] kere (respecte. Jangamkote)

MYSORE DEMANDS OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
DATE 3/8/95

ਸਾਹਿਬ ਸਿੰਘ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਵਿਚ ਹੀ ਸਿੱਖ ਰਾਜ ਦੀ ਸਥਾਪਨਾ ਹੋਈ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਦੇ ਵਿਸਤਾਰ ਦਾ ਕਾਰਜ ਵੀ ਆਰੰਭ ਹੋ ਚੁਕਾ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਲਈ ਇਹ ਸਮਾਂ ਸਿੱਖ ਇਤਿਹਾਸ ਵਿਚ ਬੜਾ ਮਹੱਤਵ ਰਖਦਾ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੀ ਸਿੱਖ ਰਾਜ ਦੀ ਸਥਾਪਨਾ ਅਤੇ ਵਿਸਤਾਰ ਦੀ ਕਹਾਣੀ ਬੜੀ ਰੋਚਕ ਅਤੇ ਪ੍ਰੇਰਨਾਦਾਇਕ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੇ ਇਤਿਹਾਸ ਦੀ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਲਈ ਸਾਨੂੰ ਕਈ ਸਾਧਨ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਹਨ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਕੁਝ ਸਮਕਾਲੀ ਲਿਖਤਾਂ ਹਨ ਅਤੇ ਕੁਝ ਬਾਅਦ ਵਿਚ ਲਿਖੀਆਂ ਗਈਆਂ ਹਨ। ਸਮਕਾਲੀ ਲਿਖਤਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਸਭ ਤੋਂ ਪ੍ਰਮੁਖ ਸਥਾਨ ਗੁਰਮੁਖੀ ਵਿਚ ਲਿਖੇ ਗਏ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਦਾ ਹੈ। ਇਹ ਪੱਤਰ ਸਿੱਖ ਸਰਦਾਰਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਲਿਖੇ ਸਨ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੀਆਂ ਜਿੱਤਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੀ ਅਗਲੀ ਯੋਜਨਾ ਬਾਰੇ ਵੀ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਲਾਹ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਹੌਸਲਾ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਚੇਤਾਵਨੀ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਆਦੇਸ਼ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਹਨ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਬੇਨਤੀ ਵੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਧੰਨਵਾਦ ਵੀ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸ਼ੁਭਕਾਮਨਾਵਾਂ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੀਆਂ ਹਨ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਅਸੀਸ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਪਿਆਰ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਯਾਦ ਵੀ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਭੁੱਲ ਵੀ ਬਖਸ਼ੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਾਫ਼ ਵੀ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਜ਼ਾ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਇਨਾਮ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਜਾਗੀਰ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਿਰੋਪਾ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਘੋੜਾ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਹਥਿਆਰ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਹਨ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਕਪੜੇ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਹਨ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਭੋਜਨ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਰਹਿਣ ਲਈ ਥਾਂ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸੁਰੱਖਿਆ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਹਿਯੋਗ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਾਥ ਵੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਮਿੱਤਰ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਭਰਾ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸੇਵਕ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਗੁਰੂ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਪਰਮੇਸ਼ਰ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਵਾਹਿਗੁਰੂ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਤਿਗੁਰੂ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਅਕਾਲ ਪੁਰਖ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਵਾਹਿਗੁਰੂ ਜੀ ਕੀ ਫ਼ਤਹਿ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਵਾਹਿਗੁਰੂ ਜੀ ਕਾ ਖ਼ਾਲਸਾ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਵਾਹਿਗੁਰੂ ਜੀ ਕੀ ਫ਼ਤਹਿ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ। ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਸਾਥੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਵਾਹਿਗੁਰੂ ਜੀ ਕਾ ਖ਼ਾਲਸਾ ਵੀ ਕਿਹਾ ਹੈ।

ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮುಂಗಟ್ಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡುವ ಪದಾರ್ಥಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಸುಂಕ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ

ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ

ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ

ಕಾಯ್ದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೧೭೮ ಮತ್ತು ೧೭೯ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳ

ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ವಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಸುಂಕ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು

ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ

ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಕಾಯ್ದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೧೭೮ ಮತ್ತು

೧೭೯ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ವಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣ

ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಸುಂಕ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು

ಚಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಕಾಯ್ದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೧೭೮ ಮತ್ತು ೧೭೯ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ನು

ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ವಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಸುಂಕ ವಸೂಲಿ

ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪಟ್ಟಣ

ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ

ಕಾಯ್ದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೧೭೮ ಮತ್ತು ೧೭೯ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ

ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ವಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಸುಂಕ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಾಗಿ

ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ

ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಕಾಯ್ದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೧೭೮ ಮತ್ತು

೧೭೯ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ವಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣ

ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಸುಂಕ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು

ಚಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಕಾಯ್ದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೧೭೮ ಮತ್ತು ೧೭೯ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ನು

ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ವಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಸುಂಕ ವಸೂಲಿ

ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪಟ್ಟಣ

ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ

ಕಾಯ್ದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೧೭೮ ಮತ್ತು ೧೭೯ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ

ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ವಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಸುಂಕ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಾಗಿ

ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ

ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಕಾಯ್ದೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ೧೭೮ ಮತ್ತು

೧೭೯ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳ ಉಪಬಂಧಗಳನ್ವಯ ಪಟ್ಟಣ

ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಸುಂಕ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು

ಚಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪಟ್ಟಣ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯವಿಧಾನವನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು

Asp
w/d
Brdt

86

[Gen. Serial No. 32.]

189

No. 5 & 3

Name of Petitioner. Seemantini Ku

Village Bandivlare Post

Taluk.

District.

Date of Application 3d August 1895

Date of Receipt. 3d Augt 1895

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

The petitioner prays that Govt Proc. No 2241 Pet 7. 288-9 dated 6th May 1895 may be reconsidered after allowing him an opportunity to represent his case personally to Govt.

A copy of the above quoted Procs is enclosed with the petition.

The petitioner's chief prayer is that he may be allowed to do the Shanbhogi duties of Anni Bhadranakere and that Anni Bhadranakere Hospet may be separated from Each other.

1895
Die file as stamp
Ref
158

Application received from one Kasseb for the Deva of the Shanbhogi of Bhadranakere
Stamp sufficient
In time
~~Date posted~~
In para 5 the petitioner says that two villages of Hospet & Anni Bhadranakere were surveyed, mapped & settled separately, & was in receipt receipt from the Govt. Should the latter had been merged in Hospete at the Settlement. The records have been called for, & this may have to be referred to in disposal of the application. He will perhaps be called for.

Received 26-8-95
Replied 27-8-95 [illegible]

37

5-53-R



5 83

Cw 1

In the Supreme Court of

Bombay in the Province of

Revenue Jurisdiction Case No. 13 of 1895-96

Petition praying for leave to appeal

Petitioners above named most humbly

and respectfully sheweth that the Proceedings

of the Government in their No. 2241

Rev. Dept. 288-92

dated Bombay the 6th May 1895 made

finally reconsidered, a certified copy of

the said Proceedings is herewith produced.

The grounds for the reconsideration

are the following viz—

I The petitioners in the drawing of the following villages viz— 1, Jarandeshwar 2 Amrapur Dabhoker, 3, Kusbaria, 4, Bajwandra, 5 Gaidaeeri and 6 Nawanagar, all these villages are situated in the Kaira District of Gujarat.

II. As regards Kusbaria, Bajwandra, Gaidaeeri and Nawanagar there is no dispute.

III. As regards Jarandeshwar, Petitioners family has got as 3rd share Jasvantsinhji family as under

the petitioner belongs has got a 3rd share and Kasaba family has got a 3rd share.

II As regards Amany Bhadrankur Hettiarchy family possesses 2/3 share as Nilaya[redacted] Devalakkamany family (i.e) the petitioners family possesses 1/3 share.

I Although Hettiarchy family possessed right V in Jangamkole and Bhadrankur as stated above still the petitioners family (i.e) Devalakkamany family has been doing the duties as Archaka for more than 60 years. This fact will be proved from a Kind perusal of the Hettiarchy patty of the year Vikary about A.D. 1839 and of the Register of 1863-64

II In 1880 Hettiarchy family presented a petition for the amalgamation of Amany Bhadrankur with their own independent village of Hospet. The Amildar passed his order dated 19th May 1880 that the amalgamation should not take place. After some Correspondence between the Deputy Commissioner and the Survey Superintendent the amalgamation was approved of.

III The petitioner having come to know this, submitted his petition dated 2nd March 1887 to the Darbar and an endorsement No 380 dated 24th March 1887 was given to the petitioner to say that the petitioner should submit the petition to the Deputy Commissioner. The petitioner therefore submitted his several petitions, the last of those is dated 29th November 1887 to the Deputy Commissioner

III In the meanwhile the Deputy Commissioner ordered the petitions to Kandachar Circuit of

Arumugam Pillai to the Settlement Officer
alleging the petitioner committed the petition of
objections, that the petitioner could not reply
accepting the orders of the Deputy Commissioner

II — In the beginning of December 1887 the
Deputy Commissioner Mr. Wilbraham called
on the Mirasidar of Kallagudi to report on
the amalgamation of Arumugam Pillai to
Koppai and Pallavarayanpettai and what objections he had
for the operation of these two villages.

X — The Deputy Commissioner Mr. Vere Benson
wrote to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey that
the two villages should be operated, and
there ended the matter.

XI — In the Remarks there was the case of
Embezzlement by Arumugam Pillai appointed
of the petitioner.

XII — The petitioner appealed on 15th August 1890
to the Government of Fort St. George in the said
case of embezzlement and prayed the
disposal of the case of amalgamation of
Arumugam Pillai & Koppai lying in the
Deputy Commissioner's office unadjusted for
three years,

XIII — The Government in their endorsement
No. 1133 dated 2/12 3rd May 1893 informed the petitioner
that the Deputy Commissioner of Karur has been
instructed to dispose of the matters connected with
the dispute of several Villages, and also

of the liability of the petitioner to pay the embezzled money

XIV The Deputy Commissioner held several enquiries and reported the matter to the Government in his letter No 1056/1129 dated the 16th June 1894

XV There upon on the 27th of September 1894 a hearing was granted to the petitioner by the Councelor Messrs. Thiruvettipa and S. R. Sivanandeshan and the case was finally decided by the government on the 6th of May 1895.

XVI The petitioner most humbly begs to submit that his petition for the reperation of damages Sivanandeshan was complete is not yet disposed of

XVII There is no necessity for the amalgamation and the Auditor and the Deputy Commissioner were also in favor of the reperation of these two villages and these two were damaged plans taken out, and settled reperating. He prays that the reperation may be kindly ordered and that he may be allowed to do his duties as Secretary of Mahamanthulankal

XVIII As regards the payment of embezzled money the petitioner begs to submit that he was taken by surprise when he came to know the Contract of his grandsa, the petitioner was also believed that his late grandsa was of good character, moreover the petitioner is

willing to pay the amount of encouragement which may be proved after strict enquiry to have been intercepted by his gumasta provided he gets back his office of Munsiffy or Chowkey Bundiankeri after seperation of the same from Mooapeer. The petitioner submitted this matter to the kind consideration of the Honorable members who heard the case on the 2nd of September last, and the petitioner understood them to have been inclined to do so. But unfortunately for the petitioner the case was not decided till a long time after the hearing and without a notice to the petitioner to represent his case before the Honorable members who decided the case on the 6th May last,

XIX The government in their Proceedings in question said that "as Amany Bundiankeri is no longer a seperate village having been amalgamated at the Survey Settlement with the adjacent village of Mooapeer the seperation of members of Bundiankeri from that of Mooapeer cannot now be sanctioned". The petitioner begs to state that if the villages are seperated, then there will be no difficulty in government kindly giving his appointment back to him, and since the question of seperation of the villages has not yet been finally decided the prays that even now the government will be

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore

Read:-

(1) Correspondence ending with Kolar Deputy Commissioner's letter No. 4656/1129 dated 16th June 1894.

(2) the records connected with the appeal filed by Sreenivasa Rao.

---

order thereon No. 22412 pet: 7.288-92 Dated Bangalore, 6th May 1895

As Amani Bhadrankere is no longer a separate village, having been amalgamated at the Survey settlement with the adjacent village of Hoospeti, the separation of the Shanbhogi of Bhadrankere from that of Hoospete cannot now be sanctioned. The Hettakki family (represented by the present official Gundappa) which is entitled to the

e shanbhogi of Hospete to the exclusion
the other branches, and to two-thirds
hare in the shanbhogi of Bhadrankere,
ill continue to hold the shanbhogi of
the combined new village, and the
titioner and Mahadeva Rao of the Desa-
Kulkarni family will be registered
as subordinate Hakdars possessing 1/3
share in the shanbhogi of Bhadrankere,
(equivalent to 1/4 of the combined village)
and allowed a preferential claim
to succeed to the office of the combined
village when no members of the Hettalkar
family are forthcoming, or to officiate
according to a system should Govern-
-ment be able to introduce such a
system. In respect of the shanbhogi
of Jangamkote and other villages, the
arrangements made by the Deputy
Commissioner, Bangalore District in
1874 and 1880, under which the office
is now held by petitioner, a member
of the Desakulkarni family will be
maintained, the members of the Hett

kindly pleased to decide the same by seperating the two villages and to give him leave his office

XX The petitioner also begs to submit that when the government wanted to amalgamate other villages with certain other villages in the same Taluk during the settlement there were objections raised by the chambers of the several villages and the government were pleased not to sanction their amalgamation and unfortunately for the petitioner these two villages alone in question were amalgamated for the seperation of which he now prays.

XXI The petitioner most humbly prays that a hearing may be kindly given to him so that he may personally represent his case to government, as the amalgamation was entirely granted for the interests of Settlement, namely,

Prayer

For the foregoing reasons the petitioner prays that the seperation of these villages may be kindly ordered and that he may be kindly allowed to do the duties of Chambergy of Sannamy Bindrukod,

Your most obedient humble servant

3d August 1895 At present Fort Bangalore
Bangalore —

2. and Kabba families who are entitled to a share in the Shanbhogi of Jan-
-gamkoti being registered as subordinate Kaldars as indicated above in the case of Hoskote.

(2) The embezzlement having taken place when Bhairavaiah was in the charge of petitioner Srinivasa Rao's gu-
-mastha, the full amount embezzled should be recovered from petitioner in two instalments i.e. half now and the other half six months hence. Should he fail to make these pay-
-ments, the misappropriated amount so far as it relates to Bhairavaiah and Jangamkoti may be received from Gundappa of the Hettaikki family who offers to pay the same, and he ap-
-pointed exclusively as Shanbhogue of these villages. If Srinivasa Rao does not pay the amount relating to the other four villages, he must be dismissed and any of the collaterals willing to pay the amount appointed.

By order
(Sd) C. Anantasamiah
Offg: Chief Secretary

Copied
MK

"True copy"

Chikkaswamy Ayyangar
For Revenue Secretary

46

Date of application for copy — 15/6/95.
by Sreenivasan.

Do ready for delivery — 5/7/95

Do delivered:-

No. of words:- 278

copying fee:- — 6-0

comptg. fee — 1-4

paper — 0-3

0-7-7

585. 7 95 pt. P.J. 283-12

589

await

letter

LR 153-95-3

47

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1895 (25)

No. 730

Name of Petitioner. Inspector Gen. Settlements

Village. Fort - Bangalore

Taluk.

District.

Date of Arst. 12-8-95

Date of Receipt 13-8-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

With reference to the decision of Govt
passed on 6-8-95 in favour of the
claim of the officers of Inam Settlement
be hereby directed to receive
petition this purpose

24/8

Revenue Council
13-8-95

Reference
Dy. C.

Ack
278

Presented in Council
13th August 1895
Refer

730

48 (25)

730 R
13/8/95

Before the Government of Mysore

Petition of Greenivasa Rao Shanbog of Panganikote and other villages in the Kiddaghatta Taluk of Kolar District.

The petitioner most respectfully begs that the Government would graciously please to grant him audience with a hearing to represent his grievances to the Government in connection with his petition of 3rd instant submitted to the Government on the subject of his claims of Vicariage of Among Bhudrankere being greatly affected by the decision of the 6th May 89 passed by the Government and the same being different from the views expressed by the Honorable members of the Council that heard the case on the 27th of September 1894.

Bangalore
12th August 1895

Panganikote Greenivasa
Fort Bangalore

Arzi + receipt of recent called for

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1395

(26)

No. 812

Name of Petitioner. J. Sellamma Kom Thimmappa

Village. Y Sampagaritta and the village of

Taluk. Chitaldrug

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 16-8-95

Date of Receipt. 17-8-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Requesting that Sanction may be accorded to the grant of Patta for the land applied for in the petition.

Petition to be returned to the petitioner with the following remarks:

Col. H. V. R.

17-8-95

Presented in person
Petr - to be treated
to another petn
received by the
Petr on 3rd Aug

Hobli
17/8/95

812

50

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. NO. 812 R.
DATE 17-8-95

Before the Government of Mysore (26)

Petition of Immuraddi Mariyappa of Yenganhalli and other villages in the Hobli of Kolar district.

That with reference to the correspondence alluded to in connection with his petition submitted to the Government on the 3rd instant the petitioner begs to state that, under a condition proposed by the Private Commissioner and the Survey Superintendent for the performance of Shanbogs duties on a system of rotation the amalgamation of Aruany Bindurekere with Hosapete was approved by the Government. But after the amalgamation the petitioner was simply directed to hand over charge of Bhudurekere on the plea that Bindurekere was amalgamated with Hosapete. The Government in their proceedings of 6th May 1895 say, that the seperation of the Shanbogs of Bhudurekere from that of Hosapete cannot now be sanctioned as they were amalgamated during the Survey settlement, and do not authorise me to officiate on a vacancy proposed and approved for the amalgamation under the influence of the existing Regulations. The petitioner begs to bring to the kind notice of the Government that there should have been no amalgamation on the existence of such Regulations, and the amalgamation sanctioned conditionally in contradiction to the existing Rules will be entitled for the seperation of these villages. The petitioner therefore prays, for a kind perusal of the records connected with the hereditary claims of the petitioner are duly effected,

Yenganhalli Immuraddi Rao
Ryot Kolar

Bangalore,
16th August 1895.

51.

1895 (27)

No. 1033

Name of Petitioner, [illegible]

Village, [illegible]

Taluk, [illegible]

District, [illegible]

Date of Arzi, 2-9-95

Date of Receipt, 4-9-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, nil

ABSTRACT.

[illegible]

Being a transcript not stamped.

Pet d. 4-9-98

1033/98

(27)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. IN. 1033 R.
DATE 4-9-98

To

The Revenue Secretary
to the Government of Mysore

Humbly sheweth

That I, Lakshmanappa Basappa Guddadeva
Revenue Officer, Chickballapur respectfully beg that
upon will be pleased to find enough to submit this for
the favorable consideration of the Government of Mysore

2. That in representation against the
Legislative, for the office of Shanbhog of Yangum-
kote and other villages in the Chickballapur Taluk Kolar Dist

3. That Lakshmi Lakshmanappa was the
Legislated Shanbhog of Yangumkote and 2 other villages
of Chickballapur dismissed from the service in 1895, by the
Chickballapur Deputy Commissioner, on the complaint
of Chikkanna Gowda, one of my caste (my paternal
uncle) and the value of the stamp paper
furnished on the deed, being prepared and submitted by him
(which were of dated 4th December 1895)

4. On appeal, the Chief Commissioner ordered in his
proceedings No. 2420/199 dated 5th December 1896, that the
Legislative rights of my father should not be
alienated away from the family

5. The Shanbhogship of Yangumkote and two other
villages in the Chickballapur Taluk, has been registered in
Majestic's Inamdar name as per Dewan's
Proceedings No. 3032/85 dated 2nd May 1850.

6. The Shanbhog, registers of Yangumkote and

5. The Village has continued in any part divided between Leonidas and Seminadan's name from 1880, notwithstanding the petitions for keeping the Places.

7. On the Strength of the Divan Proceedings of 25-27 Dated 6th May 1881, my father formed the Government for appointing him, and myself and my two Brothers as Guardians of the Remains of Villages held by him until 1876, vide petitions Dated 25.11.88, 28.10.88 and 6.9.89, respectively, which are still pending.

8. The Government in their Proceedings of 25-27 Dated 6th May 1895, ordered that if Seminadan failed to pay the amount smuggled by his gumastas for, as related to Bhaskarrao and Jayaram's, he dare might be received from Members of the Police Family who applied to pay the amount, and he be appointed exclusively as Guardian of those Villages, and if Seminadan did not pay the amount, Selecting to the other Villages be shall be dismissed and any of the Collaterals willing to pay the amount might be appointed."

9. In the Engagement by the gumastas, Seminadan Sai, alone was responsible, and my father and others had nothing to do with the Said gumastas, were in no way answerable for his misdeeds, still my father in his petition to the Board of Enquiry in 1880, requested to collect from all the misappropriated amount that may be determined from time to time and to register the Guardianship in our name. The said petition also has not yet been disposed of.

10 If the Government considered that Seminadan was liable for the acts of his gumastas, the Government in

Referring

department keep of the Standing Order to make up the
yearly of the Village in which received the Amount
demanded from the persons entitled to the respective
proofs. By some misfortune Jangamcoil Village was omitted
in my, made up separate from the Village of
Tonnigal and my Station Accounts. Upon Examining
the Standing Order I perceive my Office may be Amended
demanded more than received Jangamcoil, and
Station Keep, while due Credit in the yearly
Village, Jangamcoil Station Standing Order
Station, Considerations of the Village, Jangamcoil
Standing Order Jangamcoil & Tonnigal Village paid
by my Office, Jangamcoil Village may be
=ware may be Examined please to order that the
Amount existing to Case Jangamcoil Village may be
received from me, in the ensuing and the
Standing Order, Credited in my Name.

Gundapa of Tonnigal family as Station has offered
to pay the Amount relating to Bandanese if he should
get the Standing Order of that Village and the Govern=
=ment having Granted him the said Office, which was
not held by the Native for more than two years, the Amount should
pay the Same, relating to Bandanese.

12. The Government having ordered that the Sepa=
=rates of the Standing Order of Bandanese cannot
be Amended, as Bandanese is no more a Sepa=
=rate Village, having been annexed to the Survey
Settlement with the adjacent Village of Tonnigal

to petitioner's family, and my brothers are duly qualified to have the said Khanderao's share of the said Khanderao's property, although they are innocent and unaware of Government's independent actions.

15 That during the case, to injunction and my brothers after eight years' hearing of Government's claim has rightly decided that petitioner's brothers are not liable for petitioner's fault of ours.

14. That Government is adjusting Chandrabhaga's account of giving 8½ grand-father.

15. That Government's decision is a third share in the Khanderao's property, yet neither he nor his ancestors ever enjoyed it, for a period of 60 years.

16 For the foregoing circumstances, it humbly prayed that the Khanderao's property in addition to the other, which may be enjoyed upon me, as from the eighteen years' trial.

17. That humbly and respectfully pray that the Government may be pleased to pass me such orders as may deem fit and proper.

18 [illegible]

And for which act of justice and mercy

I pray to remain

Your Excellency's most obedient servant

Chiplunkar

2nd September 1875

Chiplunkar -

Rep 5583/95

2674 5589/95 [illegible]

WR 2611 L.R. 1283-95-b

Submit a reminder be issued for early submission of the report and records called for in this office Nos Pet and 2495 dated the P.J. 288-92 P.J. 288-92

28th August 1895.

28-11-95

Reminder issued
Rep
21-12-95

1895

No. 1542. (28)

Name of Petitioner, L. Seemiraja Rao

Village, Re-41 Fort

Taluk, Bangalore

District, Bangalore

Date of Arzi, 18-11-95

Date of Receipt, 21-11-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, Nil

ABSTRACT.

Reminder to the Peteon Petition of 3-8-95 praying for a reconsideration of Govt Proc No 2241-2 dt 6-5-95 Pet J. 288-92 regarding the Shanbhag of the Amani Bhadravathi.

States that in spite of the Petrs willingness to pay the amount misappropriated by the the Petrs forefathers in the final disposal of the case the Shanbhag has proceeded to recover the amount from the other parties connected with the case.

Prays that

that the Auditor's account may
be delayed until the disposal
of the matter by Government.

B.L.G.

25/
11/-

1. Rel
P 288-92 ✓ P ✓ Bangalore
2 Drafts
3/9.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 589
dated 3rd August 95 received at the
Dewan's Office from Hattakki Subba
Rao of Bangalore, applying for
revision of Government order
No 22412 dated 6th May 1895
P.D. 288-92

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~
enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner
~~Bangalore~~ Kolar District, with a re-
quest that, with reference to the alle-
gation in para 3 of the Petition, the
records as to what Gundappa
deposed before the Deputy Commis-
sioner may be submitted to this
office, and for reference, and
to state what steps had been ta-
ken to give effect to the Govt order
above referred to and with what
result.

2 The petition should By order, returned
By order"

28/8.
Revenue Secretary.

BANGALORE,
28 August 1895

3/9.

27-8-95.

LR 153-95

89

I will submit the pro-
ceedings containing the
deposition of Hattakki Gundappa
referred to in para 3 of
the Petn ~~of~~ and also
state what steps have
been taken to give effect
to

Box
21-11-95

87.

1842

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REC'D. NO. 1842 R
DATE 21-11-95

(28)

Before the Government of Mysore

Rev. Dis. Case No. of 1895-96

Petitioner's Association Chamberg of Mysoreans to Army Bandobast &c. villages in the Siddapet Taluk of Kolar District.

The petitioner begs to state that on the decision of the government passed in the No 22612 / 22388-92 dated 6th May 1895 dismissing the Chambers of Sarangy Bandobastkare, the petitioner has submitted his petition for reconsideration of the government on the 3rd of August 1895.

The Amildar of Siddapetta has proceeded to recover the amount of Mysoreappropriated of the petitioners grievance by the other parties connected with the Case although the petitioner has informed the Amildar of the petitioners willingness to pay up the amount on the final disposal of his case of reconsideration, the petitioner most respectfully begs that the Government would graciously please to order for a postponement of the Amildars actions in this Case until there will be a final decision of the government.

13th November 1895
Bangalore.

S. Venkatasubbiah
41 Fort Bangalore.

Records called for. 14-8-95
Not received yet. 28/8/95
Records called for received
in time. 9/12

LR 153-95-9 (61)

1895 (30) 1/2

No. 2018

Name of Petitioner, Achappa Shanbogue of

Village, Hosapur

Taluk, Devanhalli

District, Bangalore

Date of Arzi,

Date of Receipt, 9-12-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, nil

ABSTRACT.

Praying that Govt may be pleased
to hear the Petrs case in person
and relieve him of the loss he has
sustained by the amalgamation
of the Bhadrankera village
with that of the Hosapete village

Bllu
4/12.

Put up &c
12/12

The file is put up
Mr

58.

2 Drafts

Gen. 31.]

1895

(36)

LR 153-95-8

From

The Rev Secretary

To The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

Dated 28 August 1895

Despatched 31/7.

Received

General No. 2495
C.F. No. 255-92

Enclosure No.

Has the honor to request that the records, showing that Amani Bhadrakere ~~had~~ has been merged in Hospete at the Settlement, which were returned to him on the this Office No. 22412 dated 6-5-95, Pch. D. 280-92 may be resubmitted for reference.

By order

Dfh. HBh 28/8

Revenue Secretary

A
27-8-95

62.

Gen. 31.]



Recd in an
incorrect cover -
Refer
the
18/12/95

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district.

To (4) (31)
The Secretary to the Government
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 14th December
Camp Kinnakpur
Despatched 17.12.95
Received
General No. 2233
No. 574
Enclosure No. file

His docket No. 2495
RJ. 288-92
dated 28th August 1895
requesting the retransmission
of the records relating
to Amani Bhadranhere
received with Government
Proceedings No. 22412
Pet. 7. 288-92
dated 6th May 1895.

I has the honor to re-
-Submit herewith as per
accompanying ferist the
records called for in the
above.

E Mundant,
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

One Two Rupees Stamp affixed



Before the Court of Mysore.

2018

Petn
9-12-95

Petitioner Achappa shanbhog of Ibbasapura in the Devanahully Taluk of Bangalore District.

That during the Rev. Survey of the above Taluk lands attached to the petitioner's village about 138 acres in extent assessed at Rs 17.50 were included to the lands of Amanji Bhadranaika of Siddlaghatta Taluk.

2. Lands included with Bhadranaika from the petitioner's village have been included in the Pymaishy accounts of the Year Sidhereby and situated in the Taluk part of Ibbasapura

3. The Ryots of the lands included to the Bhadranaika against the petitioner's Claims were being paid to the petitioner to the survey settlements.

4 Since the petitioner's village lands were included to Bhadranaika and Bhadranaika was Amalgamated with Hosapete

Hosapete the petitioner had
lodged his complaints and since no
sufficient inquiry was made he has
been gone a loss of Rs 600-0-0 salary
annually

5. There is no reason why the lands attached to
the petitioners should have been included
with Amany Bhadravathi and the Amany
Bhadravathi an independent and large
village should have been amalgamated with
Hospet in prejudice to the claims of those
Shanbogs

6. On a hurried perusal of the Pahanis of Revenue
attached to those villages now available the
unimportance of those (Amalgamations)
Amalgamations in prejudice to the claims
of those Shanbogs can be brought to the
notice of the Govt. and the petitioner is also prepared
to prove the same by other records he has secured

7. Petitioner therefore most respectfully begs
that the Govt would be graciously pleased to
hear the petitioner's case in person and
relieve the petitioner of the loss he has
sustained without any reason from the
Amalgamation made without necessity.

63.

Petition No: 2018 2/7
9/12/95

Petitioner – Nanjappa,
Shanbogue of Bhadrakere,
Devanhalli Taluk, Bangalore
District.

Subject

~~Applying for the~~
Application for separating
his lands from Bhadrankere
and attaching from Hosjute.

(A) English petn dtd No: 2018 2/7
9/12/95.

Petr (A) says that at time the
Survey settlement of Devanhalli
Taluk, certain lands belonging
to his Shanboji about 138 acres
in extent and assessed at 135 Rs
were added on to Amani
Bhadrankere of Doddaballa
Taluk. Formerly Amani Bhadrankere
also belonged to the Devanhalli
Taluk. In 887, Amani Bhadra-
kere was amalgamated with
Hosjute. Petr wants that his
lands belonging to his Shanboji
shall be separated.

A.S.
20/1/96

P. T. O.

64

The Deputy County Clerk's letter of 3/8/95 and the Survey of Deputy Clerk's letter of 3/8/95 show that 12 Lots of the Meadow Lands are included in Meadow Lake.

AS.
2/4/96

65.

Gen. 31.]



From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

Revenue

32

Lr 153-95-11

Dated 14th December 1895

Despatched 17th.

Received

General No. 2226

No. 578

Enclosure No.

Reporting on the petition from Hattanki Subba Rau of Bangalore

Refer
VL
18/12/95

to Kuhlmann's note -
Inserts of Hattanki Subba Rau 21/12

23/12

68. Draft submitted for approval (33)

P.

(70)

To

1. R 153-95-12

The Deputy Commr
Kolar District

No. 6614 / PF 288-92 & 24.1.96.
28

Enc: One Ver: file sent separately by parcel.

His letter No. 2233/584 dated 14th Dec 1895 forwarding the records relating to Amani Bindrankere.

With reference to the above has the honor to observe that the Dy Commr's letter No 631 dated 15th Nov 1886 to the address of the Supte Devarma survey, referred to in the Superintendents Yadi No 3884 dated 17th Nov 1886 to the Dy Commr, and papers connected therewith, as well as papers showing the arrangement made during the Survey Settlement, referred to in the Dy Commrs letter

(71)

No 2903/689 dated 7th January 1891 ~~are not~~ in this office, are not in the file, and to request that they may be forwarded to this office as early as practicable.

Petitioner Srinivasaiken states in para 17 of his Petn. pp 583 of 3 - August 1895 that the two villages of Hospete and Amani Bhadrankeri were surveyed, mapped and settled separately. The Dy Comr is requested to be so good as to state if this allegation is true and if so what led to the subsequent amalgamation.

The file rec'd with his letter No 2133/584 of 14 inst. is herewith sent for reference & return.

B. O.

24/1

for Revenue Secretary

24/1

66.

Kolar District Deputy Commissioner's
Office.
Camp Srinivaspur, dated 14th December 1895

To,

The Revenue Secretary
to the Government of Mysore

Sir,

Adverting to your official memorandum
No. Pet. / F. 288-92 dated 28th August 1895 forwarding a petition from Kettaiah Subbaroo of Bangalore, applying for review of Government order No. 2212 / F. 288-92 dated 6th May 1895 regarding the Kanbhogue of Amani Siddram Pare and three villages in the Siddaghatta Taluq, I have the honor to state that the proceedings containing deposition referred to in para 3 of the petition have been forwarded with this office docket No. 2233 / 584 of today's date.

2. The Amildar's urzi No. 445 dated 28/30 Ult.mo filed with those proceedings shows that a notice has been served on Jangam Kote Srinivasa Rao calling upon him to make good the embezzled

X Urzi with record filed with this office docket No. 2233/584

money, but that the latter wants time pending disposal of his application to the Council for a review of the Government orders alluded to above.

3. The Amildar reports that he has also issued a similar notice to Mettakki Gundappa and that the result will be reported shortly. He has sent up two petitions as per margin[x] one from J. Lakshminarayanappa, son of Sungam-Kote Gundappah, and the other from Chitamber Rao, son of Mahadeva Rao, both of the Deshkulkarni family offer-ing to pay up the embezzled money relating to the 5 villages of Hireballa, Byrasandra, Sanamanya, Gollahalli and Nayamgutta Hemanahalli.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

[signature]

Deputy Commissioner,

Kolar District.

x: Petition Registered No: 3504/55 dated 14.8: September /95 from J. Lakshminarayanapah. — Do — petitions No dated 13: November /95 from Chitamber Rao. Filed with the records sent with this office docket No. dated December /95.

P.7288

70.

Gen. 31.]

189

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 713
20 MAR 96
DEWAN'S OFFICE

34

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar district

To Revenue and General
The Secretary to the
~~Government of~~ Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 4th March 96

Despatched 9th do.

Received

General No. 3466
No. 917

Enclosure No. 1 File

Furnishing information relating to Amani Padraiyar - ker in the Civil Justice Courts

Rev. Dept
20/3/96
Petition Br
20/3/96

Submitted
21/3

11.

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's
Office.
Dated 14th March 1896.

To,

The Secretary to the Govern-
ment of Mysore.
Revenue General Dept.

Sir,

Adverting to your docket No 66 2
DT 288-92
dated 24th January 1896 calling for
certain further information and c—
papers relative to Mr Madrana-
kere in the Sidlaghatta Taluk, I have th
honor in resubmitting the records which
accompanied the same to Govt and here-
with a file received with the Survey Sub-
intendent's docket No 625 dated 7th c
Ultimo which contains the papers required
in the first para of your docket.

2. Meg to state that the arrangement
alluded to in the last para of Mr. c—
Madiah's letter No 2903/689 dated 7th January

87

748

Gen. 31]

1896

76 From The Superintendent Mysore Revenue Survey

To The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District

Dated 11th March

Despatched

Received

General No. 919
No.

Enclosure No.

His docket No 3087 of 1454
22nd instno. -

In returning the Vernacular correspondence received with the above, has the honor to state that the Villages in question were Surveyed and Settled Separately and to refer to this office yadi no 2661 dated 20th September 1886 and his reply thereto no 631 dated 15 November 1886 filed in the above correspondence which will give the required information "Copy" Paragraph

G. J. P. Grant
Superintendent
M.R. Survey

Vide Survey Orientendents yadi No 266 dated 20th September 1886 from the Survey Superintendent.

180 — Survey Dy — 80 — No 148 dated 5th — 1896

3. As regard to the suggestion made by the Survey Department that the Straits Rogue Tribes may be permitted to acquire property by relation.

3. With regard to the enquiry contained in the 2nd para of your docket under reply. I beg to enclose copy of the Survey Superintendent's docket No 9/10 dated the 11th Instant from which it will be observed that the two villages of Kopete and Emani Gadaranakere were surveyed, mapped and settled separately and that the subsequent amalgamation was effected for the reasons explained in that officer's yadi No 266/ of the 20th September 1886 and accepted by the then Deputy Commissioner Mr. C. Soobrow in his yadi No 631 dated 5th November 1896.

4. The Amildar reports that Kattaki

Gau

Gundappa who was served with a notice
to willing to make good the embezzled
money as far as it relates to Thadiyan-
kere and Jangamkote on his being
allowed to take charge of the Thadi-
yangesh of the last named village.
Mad Nazeers Nos 508 and 517 dated 3rd.
respectively the 6th and 9th January 1896
with their enclosures on the subject are
also submitted for orders.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Dy. Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

Jet

in the amount of Potege paid to him.

(5) Correspondence ending with letter no: 3466/917 dated 14th March 1896 from the Dy. Commissioner Kolar District and the records received herewith.

Order thereon: — 9909-10
9/5/13. 5-9-96 Sm. 4. No. 7238-92

The order of the 6th May 1895 is correct and cannot be revised.

2. From the proceedings, the two villages, Hospete and Bharankere, appear to have formed one village before 1835, and though, since that year, they have been treated as two different villages, they were, after mature consideration, shortly after the survey settlement, combined into one village.

3. Petitioner Srinivasa Rao urges that the Amalgamation

was

75 Proceedings of the Govt. of Bombay

Read:-

Petitions Nos: 583, 730 812 and 1342 of 1895-96 from Nagendrabhai Kinnarao Kavi praying for the separation of Katrenee Nagarpalika from the Taluka of Kopergaon with which it was amalgamated at the time of settlement, and for the appointment of Petitioner as Standing Officer in modification of Govt. order dated 6th May 1895 No. 2412/19.28.92

2. Petition No 589 and 2021 of 1895-96 from Shettarkhi Lukha Row praying that in modification of the Govt. order referred to his claim to make good the amount embezzled by Gumasta Ramanandaraya and to hold the office of Standing Officer of the combined new village in preference to Shettarkhi Ramappa

May

LR 153-95 14

may be recognized, or that the Local Kuekaras may be permitted to hold the office by turns or that the Potgi of the office may be distributed among Kuekaras as agreed by Gundappa.

(3). Petition No. 1053 of 1895-a 16 from J. Lakshmanarappa praying that on the failure of J. Srinivasa Rau to pay the sums due in respect of Bangarupete and the 4 villages noted in the margin, the same may be remitted from him, and that he be registered as Shanbog of those villages.

× Hirehalla
Bhairavandra
Gollalli
Hanumadalli

(4) Petition No. 2018 of 1895-a 16 from Achappa Shanbog of Hanumadi Timmapatna Taluk, of Tumkur Complaining of the amalgamation of 130 acres of land belonging to his village with Kasipete and consequent decrease

in

was ordered on the 18.
understanding that the
Hissedars should hold
the Office of the combined
new village by rotation;
but the order of the 6th
May 1895 was not based
upon the circumstance
that the Shanbogues could
work by rotation, nor
was the system of rotation
an essential condition of
the order. The
possibility of such an
arrangement was suggested
if certain rules in the
contemplation of Govt
came into force, but the
arrangement is attended with
great difficulty and will
give rise to much confusion,
uncertainty of responsibility,
and mischief.

.. As between Petitioner
Srinivasa Row and
Kettakki Gundappa, the
latter was the owner of a
larger right in the Shanbogi
of Khadambur and was
very properly appointed

(80)

2/

GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO

the Shantagé of the Contract village. She cannot now be interfered with.

5. Petitioner Scrimgeour's Rule application for review of the order of the 6th May 1895 are therefore rejected. He should be called upon to produce the undertaking amount within a time to be fixed by the Deputy Commissioner, and if he fails to do so effect must be given to the direction in the order of 6th May 1895, that he should be dismissed.

6. In the matter of the petitions of Hellatikei Indian Rose, the precedent cited, viz, the order passed on the 24th May 1890 in regard to the Shantagé of Kocaiiltun and Kagwa Falls in the Madagascar Islands, permitting the shares to be offered by terms

Brantford

the interest of the Hattakki family to which Gundappa belongs, in the Shanbogi of Jungamkote, is limited to one-third only.

8. The Complaint of Achappa, Shanbog of Nibaragapur, cannot now be heeded at this distance of time, and is rejected.

5-5-96

Draft.

Secretary.

To

The Dy. Commr. Kolar Dt with records and copies of endorsements issued D Peto.

& Supdt. Rev. Survey.

* sending herewith on 6/5/96.

IMR
5/5/96

paying the land. As regards however the amount which relates to Jangamkote and the Lemo due in respect of the marginally noted villages, the shanbogi of which is that of Jangamkote, is held by Srinivasa Row, the request of ~~Ba~~ Pet Lakshminarasappa, who appears to be a collateral heir of Srinivasa Row, being his brother's son, that, on default by Srinivasa Row, he should be permitted to pay the same, seems not unreasonable. It does not appear that Petitioner Lakshminarasappa was a party to the proceedings of 1895. The Deputy Commissioner will enquire into the matter of his petition in the presence of Gundappa, Petitioner Lakshminarasappa and others interested, and dispose of it as he thinks proper. It is noted that the

Kaladilla
Bilvamanda
Jodihalli
Hemmanahalli

must be regarded as
overruled, and for
the reasons stated above
this Petitioner's application
for sanction to such
an arrangement cannot
be granted. Further
there any ground to
declare Kempappa or
to revive, in favour of
the Petitioner, the order
passed about the
recovery of the amount
embezzled, from Kempappa,
these applications are
therefore rejected.

J." Kempappa being
the Shanbog of Bhadra-
-kere (now comprised
in Harpele), that portion
of the amount embezzled
which related to Bhadra-
kere, may be recovered
from him as directed
in the 2nd order of 6th May
1895, in the event of
Seringapatam Rule Nisi

passing

83.

20-05-96

13-5-96

LR 153-95-C

86.

20-ಮಾರ್ಚ್
13-5-96

(37) (36)

ನವೆಂಬರ್
2018

(88)

KR 153-95-16

85.

4.

5.

6.

A. O.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. [illegible]

2. [illegible]

3. [illegible]

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Lr 153-95-18

(38)

13-5-96

589-9471